



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/510,607

02/22/2000

Brian M. Kennedy

020431.0662

2320

53184 7590 02/06/2008
i2 TECHNOLOGIES US, INC.
ONE i2 PLACE, 11701 LUNA ROAD
DALLAS, TX 75234

EXAMINER

KOPPIKAR, VIVEK D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3626

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/06/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/510,607	Applicant(s) KENNEDY, BRIAN M.	
	Examiner VIVEK D. KOPPIKAR	Art Unit 3626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Application

1. This communication is in response to the amendment filed on October 31, 2007. Claims 11-42 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 11-16, 18, 27-32, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over James et al., EP 425,405 A2 (hereinafter James) in view of Fields et al., Pat. No.5,459,656 (hereinafter Fields) and Rhodes, Dusty, "The keys to the enterprise: integrated applications drive information systems to new horizons - enterprise wide integration"(hereinafter Rhodes).

(A) As to claim 11, James discloses a system for managing data associated with available-to-promise (ATP) products (processes that take place in a typical manufacturing environment from the time the orders are received and the logic to arrive at the capability to promise and confirm planned shipping dates based on capacity constraints and product availability)(page 5, col. 2, lines 32-49), comprising:

- (a) planned supply of the product (i.e. planned orders to cover net requirements)(page 4, col. 1, lines 16-22 and page 7, col. 1, lines 47-51); and

Art Unit: 3626

(b) customer orders for the product through the seller (i.e. customer order servicing)(page 5, col. 2, lines 32-43).

James does not explicitly disclose two seller models that each represent a seller for one or more products each product being associated with a product forecast model; and forecasted sales of the product through the seller.

However, Fields discloses each product being associated with a product forecast model (i.e. model covers each of a plurality of products)(col. 2, lines 1-9 and col. 5, lines 46-63); and forecasted sales of the product through the seller (i.e. forecast profile)(col. 3, lines 41-53).

Finally, Fields discloses at least two seller models that each represent a seller for one or more products (i.e. the model should cover each of a plurality of products or business items to determine future business demand for a specific location)(col. 2, lines 1-9).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include the teachings of Fields within the James system in order to provide products in timely response to customer demands (col. 1, lines 37-43).

James does not explicitly disclose pre-allocated supply of the product to the seller and the system operable to compute the amount of the product that is ATP at the seller according to the planned supply, the customer orders, the pre-allocated supply and the amount of the product that is ATP at one or more other sellers at a higher level in a seller hierarchy.

However, Rhodes discloses pre-allocated supply of the product to the seller (i.e plan sales expectations)(pages 1 and 2) and the system operable to compute the amount of the product that is ATP at the seller according to the planned supply, the customer orders, the pre-allocated supply and the amount of the product that is ATP at one or more other sellers (i.e. linking sales

Art Unit: 3626

and marketing strategies to material and resource scheduling ...)(page 3). As per the recitation of “the pre-allocation of the supply of the product to the seller occurring prior to distribution of the pre-allocated supply of the product to the seller,” the Examiner respectfully submits that Rhodes discloses an order department being able to “look” into the manufacturing system to determine what is currently in production to give a viable ATP date (page 2). It is noted that a product must be allocated to a seller before it is distributed to the seller. For example, a customer placing an order for a product and being told when it will be delivered has “allocated” the product for himself (See also Applicant’s Background of the Invention, page 2, lines 15-26). The product is then delivered to the customer (“distributed”) after an order has been placed (See also Applicant’s Background of the Invention, page 2, lines 15-26). As per the recitation of “at a higher level in a seller hierarchy,” Rhodes discloses allowing business information systems to communicate with different trading partnerships, where the system encompass the flow of physical goods (and information) from the supplying organizations into the businesses and subsequently to its customers (page 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include the features as disclosed by Rhodes within the James and Fields combination for the motivation of allowing access to relevant data, facilitating fast decision making and providing material and resource management information to sales and marketing teams (page 1).

(B) As to claim 12, James does not explicitly disclose the system of Claim 11, further operable to adjust the pre-allocated supply according to one or more business criteria selected from the

Art Unit: 3626

group consisting of seller criteria, product criteria, forecast criteria, supply criteria, customer order criteria, and policy criteria.

However, Rhodes discloses the system of Claim 11, further operable to adjust the pre-allocated supply according to one or more business criteria selected from the group consisting of seller criteria, product criteria, forecast criteria, supply criteria, customer order criteria, and policy criteria (i.e. forecasting and DRP)(page 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include the system of Claim 11, further operable to adjust the pre-allocated supply according to one or more business criteria selected from the group consisting of seller criteria, product criteria, forecast criteria, supply criteria, customer order criteria, and policy criteria as disclosed by Rhodes within the James and Fields combination for the motivation of allowing access to relevant data, facilitating fast decision making and providing material and resource management information to sales and marketing teams (page 1).

(C) As to claim 13, James, and Fields do not explicitly disclose the system of Claim 11, further operable to:

communicate forecast models to a remote system; receive from the remote system a promise computed at the remote system for a customer order requesting a quantity of a product through the seller, the promise being computed according to the allocated supply; receive from the remote system adjusted forecast models reflecting the promise; and recompute the amount of the product that is ATP at the seller.

However, James discloses receiving a promise for a customer order requesting a quantity of a product through the seller, the promise being computed according to the allocated supply

Art Unit: 3626

(see abstract, page 5, col. 1, lines 33-59 and page 6, col. 1, lines 18-30). James further discloses receiving a promise for a customer order requesting a quantity of a product through the seller, the promise being computed according to the allocated supply re-computing the amount of the product that is ATP at the seller (page 3, col. 2, line 48 - page 4, col. 1, line 1). In addition, Fields discloses receiving adjusted forecast models reflecting the promise (i.e. variation between actual demand and the forecasted demand is used to update base and influence profiles and the forecasted demand is re-determined)(see abstract and col. 15 and col. 21, line 18 - col. 22, line 12).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include receiving adjusted forecast models reflecting the promise as disclosed by Fields within the James system in order to provide products in timely response to customer demands (col. 1, lines 37-43).

Although James and Fields do not explicitly disclose remotely located systems, Rhodes discloses enterprise wide integration of sales, marketing, material and resource systems (i.e. SOP)(see abstract). Rhodes further discloses that forecast information is communicated to a remote system (i.e. forecasting is used to drive the master production schedule) (page 3, lines 11-25). The remote system transmits a promise reflecting a customer order requesting a quantity of a product through the seller, the promise being computed according to the allocated supply (i.e. MPS linked with order management such that when a customer places an order..., to determine what's currently in production to give viable available to promise dates)(page 3, lines 12-25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include performing the steps of claim 13 in remotely located systems within the

Art Unit: 3626

James and Fields combination for the motivation of achieving business goals such as improved customer service, increased productivity and greater profitability (page 1, lines 43-45 and page 2, lines 14-25).

James and Fields do not explicitly disclose computing a promise for the customer order, the promise being computed according to the pre-allocated supply of the product.

However, Rhodes discloses computing a promise for the customer order, the promise being computed according to the pre-allocated supply of the product (page 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include computing a promise for the customer order, the promise being computed according to the pre-allocated supply of the product as disclosed by Rhodes within the James and Fields combination for the motivation of allowing access to relevant data, facilitating fast decision making and providing material and resource management information to sales and marketing teams (page 1).

(D) As to claim 14, James does not explicitly disclose the system of Claim 13, wherein: all forecast models for one or more sellers are communicated to the remote system; the system receives from the remote system a promise also computed according to the amount of product that is ATP at one or more other sellers; and adjust the amount of the product that is ATP at one or more other sellers if the promise exceeds the allocated supply for the seller.

However, James discloses receiving a promise for a customer order computed according to the amount of product that is ATP at one or more other sellers (see abstract, page 5, col. 1, lines 33-59 and page 6, col. 1, lines 18-30). James further discloses adjusting the amount that is ATP at one or more other sellers if the promise exceeds the allocated supply for the seller (page

Art Unit: 3626

3, col. 2, line 48 - page 4, col. 1, line 1). In addition, Fields discloses receiving forecast models for one or more sellers (see abstract and col. 6, lines 35-60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include receiving forecast models for one or more sellers within the James system in order to provide products in timely response to customer demands (col. 1, lines 37-43).

Although James and Fields do not explicitly disclose remotely located systems, Rhodes discloses enterprise wide integration of sales, marketing, material and resource systems (i.e. SOP)(see abstract). Rhodes further discloses that forecast information is communicated to a remote system (i.e. forecasting is used to drive the master production schedule) (page 3, lines 11-25). The remote system transmits a promise reflecting a customer order requesting a quantity of a product through the seller, the promise being computed according to the allocated supply (i.e. MPS linked with order management such that when a customer places an order., to determine what's currently in production to give viable available to promise dates)(page 3, lines 12-25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include performing the steps of claim 13 in remotely located systems within the James and Fields combination in order to achieve business goals such as improved customer service, increased productivity and greater profitability (page 1, lines 43-45 and page 2, lines 14-25).

James and Fields do not explicitly disclose adjusting the amount that is ATP at one or more sellers if the promise exceeds the pre-allocated supply of the product to the seller.

However, Rhodes discloses adjusting the amount that is ATP at one or more sellers if the promise exceeds the pre-allocated supply of the product to the seller (page 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include adjusting the amount that is ATP at one or more sellers if the promise exceeds the pre-allocated supply of the product to the seller as disclosed by Rhodes within the James and Fields combination for the motivation of allowing access to relevant data, facilitating fast decision making and providing material and resource management information to sales and marketing teams (page 1).

(E) As to claim 15, James does not explicitly disclose the system of Claim 11, wherein the forecast model further represents a quantity of the product the seller has committed to selling, the system operable to adjust the pre-allocated supply of the product for the seller according to the committed quantity.

However, Rhodes discloses the system of Claim 11, wherein the forecast model further represents a quantity of the product the seller has committed to selling, the system operable to adjust the pre-allocated supply of the product for the seller according to the committed quantity (i.e. link sales and marketing strategies to material and resource scheduling)(page 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include the system of Claim 11, wherein the forecast model further represents a quantity of the product the seller has committed to selling, the system operable to adjust the pre-allocated supply of the product for the seller according to the committed quantity as disclosed by Rhodes within the James and Fields combination for the motivation of allowing access to relevant data,

Art Unit: 3626

facilitating fast decision making and providing material and resource management information to sales and marketing teams (page 1).

(F) As to claim 16, James discloses the system of Claim 11, further operable to:

accept a customer order requesting a quantity of a product through the seller (page 6, col. 1, lines 38-50). James does not explicitly disclose compute a promise for the customer order according to the planned supply and one or more existing customer orders, the promise restricted according to the pre-allocated supply of the product.

However, Rhodes discloses computing a promise for the customer order according to the planned supply and one or more existing customer orders, the promise restricted according to the pre-allocated supply of the product (page 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include computing a promise for the customer order according to the planned supply and one or more existing customer orders, the promise restricted according to the pre-allocated supply of the product as disclosed by Rhodes within the James and Fields combination for the motivation allowing access to relevant data, facilitating fast decision making and providing material and resource management information to sales and marketing teams (page 1).

(G) As to claim 18, James discloses the system of Claim 11, further operable to adjust either the forecasted sales or the pre-allocated supply for a product for the seller according to an arrival rate of customer orders for the product through the seller (page 5, col. 1, line 33 - col. 2, line 18 and page 6, col. 1, lines 38-50).

(H) As to claim 27, the claim is the corresponding method claim to system claim 11 and is rejected on the same basis as claim 11.

(I) As to claims 28-32, and 34, the claims are similar in scope to claims 12-16, and 18 and are rejected on the same basis.

4. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over James, Fields and Rhodes as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Frank O. Smith, "Dun & Bradstreet Software Delivers Sales and Promotion System to Manufacturers" (hereinafter Smith).

(A) As to claim 17, James does not explicitly disclose the system of Claim 11, wherein:
each forecast model is extensible such that one or more policy rules may be associated with the corresponding product; each policy rule comprises a restriction on either the forecasted sales or the pre-allocated supply of the product for the seller; and
either the forecasted sales or the pre-allocated supply of the product is computed according to the policy rules.

However, Smith discloses each forecast model is extensible such that one or more policy rules may be associated with the corresponding product (i.e. SPS allows manufacturers to create and manage special product promotions based on product categories or items)(page 1, lines 21-30). Smith further discloses each policy rule comprises a restriction on either the forecasted sales or the allocated supply for the seller (i.e. price and discount effectivity dating)(page 2, lines 1-5). Finally, Smith discloses either the forecasted sales or the allocated supply is computed according

Art Unit: 3626

to the policy rules (i.e. The system takes into account impact of scheduling the requested customer orders with orders already in progress.(page 4, col. 2, lines 35-47, page 5, col. 1, lines 37-40 and page 6, col. 2, lines).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include the features of Smith within the James, Fields and Rhodes combination for the motivation of speed and ease of online management of orders tied to special promotions (page 1, lines 32-34).

5. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over James, Fields, and Rhodes as applied to claim 27 above, and further in view of Smith.

(A) As to claim 33, the claim is similar in scope to claim 17 and is rejected on the same basis.

6. Claims 19-26, 35-37, and 39-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over James in view of Fields, Rhodes and Smith.

(A) As to claim 19, James discloses a system for managing data associated with available-to-promise (ATP) products (i.e. processes that take place in a typical manufacturing environment from the time the orders are received and the logic to arrive at the capability to promise and confirm planned shipping dates based on capacity constraints and product availability)(page 5, col. 2, lines 32-49), comprising:

planned supply of the product (i.e. planned orders to cover net requirements)(page 4, col. 1, lines 16-22 and page 7, col. 1, lines 47-51);

customer orders for the product through the seller (i.e. customer order servicing)(page 5, col. 2, lines 32-43); and

allocated supply of the product to the seller (i.e. The system takes into account impact of

Art Unit: 3626

scheduling the requested customer orders with orders already in progress. Check if there is unallocated inventory. If the system checks to see if there is unallocated inventory, then some of the inventory is allocated.)(page 4, col. 2, lines 35-47, page 5, col. 1, lines 37-40 and page 6, col. 2, lines 3-16); and

wherein the system is operable to compute the amount of the product that is ATP at the seller according to the planned supply, the customer orders, the allocated supply, and the amount of the product that is ATP at one or more other sellers (i.e. planned production activity performed by CRP system, customer orders, allocated supply)(page 4, col. 2, lines 48-59, page 5, col. 1, line 33 - col. 2, line 18, and page 7, col. 1, lines 47-51).

James does not explicitly disclose each product being associated with a product forecast model and forecasted sales of the product through the seller. However, Fields discloses each product being associated with a product forecast model (i.e. model covers each of a plurality of products) (col. 2, lines 1-9 and col. 5, lines 46-63); and forecasted sales of the product through the seller (i.e. forecast profile)(col. 3, lines 41-53).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include each product being associated with a product forecast model and forecasted sales of the product through the seller within the James system in order to provide products in timely response to customer demands (col. 1, lines 37-43).

James and Fields do not explicitly disclose pre-allocated supply of the product to the seller, the pre-allocated supply being a supply for the product that has been pre-allocated to the seller for promising to subsequent customer orders for the product through the seller, the pre-allocation of the supply of the product to the seller occurring prior to distribution of the pre-

Art Unit: 3626

allocated supply of the product to the seller, and the system is operable to compute the product that is ATP at a seller according to the planned supply, the customer orders, the pre-allocated supply and the amount that is ATP at one or more of the sellers at a higher level in a seller hierarchy.

However, Rhodes discloses pre-allocated supply of the product to the seller (i.e plan sales expectations)(pages 1 and 2) and the system is operable to compute the amount of the product that is ATP at a seller according to the planned supply, the customer orders, the allocated supply and the amount of the product that is ATP at one or more other sellers (page 3). As per the recitation of “the pre-allocation of the supply of the product to the seller occurring prior to distribution of the pre-allocated supply of the product to the seller,” the Examiner respectfully submits that Rhodes discloses an order department being able to “look” into the manufacturing system to determine what is currently in production to give a viable ATP date (page 2). It is noted that a product must be allocated to a seller before it is distributed to the seller. For example, a customer placing an order for a product and being told when it will be delivered has “allocated” the product for himself (See also Applicant’s Background of the Invention, page 2, lines 15-26). The product is then delivered to the customer (“distributed”) after an order has been placed (See also Applicant’s Background of the Invention, page 2, lines 15-26). As per the recitation of “at a higher level in a seller hierarchy,” Rhodes discloses allowing business information systems to communicate with different trading partnerships, where the system encompass the flow of physical goods (and information) form the supplying organizations into the businesses and subsequently to its customers (page 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include pre-allocated supply of the product to the seller, the pre-allocated supply being a supply for the product that has been pre-allocated to the seller for promising to subsequent customer orders for the product through the seller and the system is operable to compute the product that is ATP at a seller according to the planned supply, the customer orders, the pre-allocated supply and the amount that is ATP at one or more of the sellers as disclosed by Rhodes within the James and Fields combination for the motivation of ease of allowing access to relevant data, facilitating fast decision making and providing material and resource management information to sales and marketing teams (page 1).

James, Fields and Rhodes do not explicitly disclose at least one seller model representing a seller for products that each correspond to an item having one or more restrictions on its sale, at least two products corresponding to the same item but with at least one different restriction.

However, Smith discloses at least one seller model representing a seller for products that each correspond to an item having one or more restrictions on its sale, at least two products corresponding to the same item but with at least one different restriction (i.e. SPS enables manufacturers to easily track and manage special sales promotions separate and independent of standard company pricing policy. SPS enables manufacturers to create and manage special product promotions based on ... by customer type or specific customer account.)(page 1, lines 21-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include at least one seller model representing a seller for products that each correspond to an item having one or more restrictions on its sale, at least two products

Art Unit: 3626

corresponding to the same item but with at least one different restriction within the James, Fields and Rhodes system in order to speed and ease online management of orders tied to special promotions (page 1, lines 32-34).

(B) As to claim 20, James discloses the system of Claim 19, wherein the restrictions are selected from the group consisting of quantity restrictions, and lead time restrictions (i.e. whether customer specified date can be met. Check if requirements can be satisfied by unallocated inventory or unallocated scheduled production.)(page 5, col. 1, line 33 - col. 2, line 18).

James does not explicitly disclose wherein the restrictions are selected from price restrictions. However, Smith discloses wherein the restrictions are selected from price restrictions (i.e. ,manage special sales promotions separate and independent of standard company pricing policy). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include wherein the restrictions are selected from price restrictions within the James, Fields and Rhodes system in order to speed and ease online management of orders tied to special promotions (page 1, lines 32-34).

(C) As to claim 21, the claim is similar in scope to claim 12 and is rejected on the same basis.

(D) As to claim 22, the claim is similar in scope to claim 13 and is rejected on the same basis.

(E) As to claim 23, the claim is similar in scope to claim 15 and is rejected on the same basis.

(F) As to claim 24, James and do not explicitly disclose the system of Claim 19, further operable to:

computing a promise for the customer according to the pre-allocated supply for corresponding products.

However, Rhodes discloses computing a promise for the customer order, the promise being computed according to the pre-allocated supply of the product (page 2, lines 8-15 and lines 28-33). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include computing a promise for the customer according to the pre-allocated supply for corresponding products as disclosed by Rhodes within the James and Fields combination for the motivation of allowing access to relevant data, facilitating fast decision making and providing material and resource management information to sales and marketing teams (page 1).

James, Fields and Rhodes do not explicitly disclose accept a customer order requesting quantities of one or more items through the seller; and compute a promise for the customer order according to the allocated supply for corresponding products, wherein the promise comprises a plurality of options each with one or more of the restrictions specified for these products.

However Smith discloses accepting a customer order requesting quantities of one or more items through the seller and computing a promise for the customer order according to the allocated supply for corresponding products, wherein the promise comprises a plurality of options each with one or more of the restrictions specified for these products (i.e. SPS enables manufacturers to easily track and manage special sales promotions separate and independent of standard company pricing policy. System enhancements include on line available to promise by item ...)(page 1, lines 21-30 and page 2, lines 1-5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include accepting a customer order requesting quantities of one or more items through the seller and computing a promise for the customer order according to the allocated supply for corresponding products, wherein the promise comprises a plurality of options each

Art Unit: 3626

with one or more of the restrictions specified for these products within the James, Fields and Rhodes system in order to speed and ease online management of orders tied to special promotions (page 1, lines 32-34).

(G) As to claim 25, the claim is similar in scope to claim 17 and is rejected on the same basis.

(H) As to claim 26, the claim is similar in scope to claim 18 and is rejected on the same basis

(I) As to claim 35, the claim is the corresponding method claim to system claim 19 and is rejected on the same basis as claim 19.

(J) As to claims 36-42, the claims are similar in scope to claims 20-26 and are rejected on the same basis.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicants arguments and amendments filed on October 31, 2007 have overcome the Claim Objections, 35 U.S.C. 101 rejections and 35 U.S.C. 112 rejections set forth in the Office Action dated August 10, 2007.

8. Applicant's arguments filed on October 31, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

(1) With regard to the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections, the applicants argue that Fields does not teach "at least two seller models that each represent a seller for one or more products" wherein each product is associated with a "product forecast model". However, Fields clearly discloses two seller models (Fields: Col. 2, Ln. 1-9). Fields contemplates that a model can cover a plurality of business items and the Office, therefore, takes the position that this means that the model disclosed in Fields can be applied to many different business items wherein each item is covered by a model. Therefore, since Fields disclose a plurality of items that can be covered by

Art Unit: 3626

its model it inherently discloses a plurality (including two) seller models. It is entirely possible that the two products Fields mentions in the above cited passages come from two different sellers.

(2) Applicants argue that the Rhodes reference does not teach the step of “computing the amount of product” and state that the feature of “better satisfying the current planned level of sales” does not equate to “computing the amount of product.” The Office disagrees with this contention. The system of Rhodes enables a user to satisfy the current level of sales, therefore, in order to satisfy a level of sales the system of Rhodes must necessarily “compute the amount of product” otherwise how would Rhodes inform a user on how to “satisfy the current planned level of sales.” The applicants argue that “the equations forming the foundation of the Examiner’s comparison between Rhodes and independent Claim 11 cannot be made.” It is not clear to the Office what the applicants are intending to argue from this quoted language. The Office has not cited to any equations in Rhodes in the rejection of Claim 11 and in fact the Office is citing to passages in Rhodes in the rejection of Claim 11 which teach a means to “compute the amount of product”.

(3) Applicants argue that the prior art must disclose each and every element of the claimed invention and that any motivation to combine or modify the prior art must be based upon a suggestion in the prior art. Applicants argue that the prior art used in the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections do not teach each and every limitation and also that there is no motivation for combining these references. However, the Office would like to note that the prior art does in fact teach each and every element of the claimed invention. The motivation to combine or modify the prior art is also taken from the prior art, as cited above in the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections.

Conclusion

9. If any attempt to reach the examiner by telephone is unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas, can be reached at (571) 272-6776. The fax telephone numbers for this group are either (571) 273-8300 or (703) 872-9326 (for official communications including After Final communications labeled "Box AF").

Another resource that is available to applicants is the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR). Information regarding the status of an application can be obtained from the (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAX. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, please feel free to contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sincerely,

Vivek Koppikar

2/7/2008

/Robert Morgan/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3626